

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

* * *

First 100, LLC,

Case No. 2:17-cv-01438-JCM-DJA

Plaintiff,

Order

V.

Cenlar, FSB, et al.,

Defendants.

Order

This is a quiet title action arising out of real property located in Las Vegas, Nevada. The Honorable District Judge James C. Mahan ordered the parties to file a joint status report. (ECF No. 148). In their status report, the parties explained that discovery dates had expired and asked the Court to set a scheduling conference or enter a scheduling order to set deadlines applicable to the appearing parties. (ECF No. 153).¹ Because the joint status report did not explain the status of discovery or respective needs of the parties, the undersigned ordered the parties to instead stipulate to a proposed scheduling order. (ECF No. 154). The parties then filed another joint status report, explaining that they would not need to reopen discovery. (ECF No. 155). Instead, the parties requested a trial date and asked, “that the Court set a Pretrial Conference on a date convenient to the Court in advance of the selected trial date.” (*Id.*).

Because the parties are requesting to move forward with trial, they will need to submit a joint pretrial order. *See* LR 16-4; *see* LR 26-1(b)(5). The Court thus orders the parties to submit their joint pretrial order by Wednesday, April 6, 2022. However, the Court denies the parties request for a pretrial conference without prejudice. The parties have not outlined what topics they wish to address at the conference or whether briefing will be necessary. The Court does not

¹ The parties first joint status report is filed as ECF No. 151. The parties filed their amended status report one day later at ECF No. 153.

1 typically conduct pretrial conferences without a written request, and this information is vital to
2 the undersigned's ability to schedule and conduct this conference.² See LR 16-2. The parties
3 may move or stipulate to a pretrial conference if, after they file their joint pretrial order,
4 outstanding issues remain which they would like to address with the undersigned at a pretrial
5 conference.

6

7 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the parties' joint pretrial order is due on or before
8 **Wednesday, April 6, 2022.**

9 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the parties' request for a pretrial conference is **denied**
10 **without prejudice.**

11

12

DATED: March 7, 2022

13

14



DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

² It is unclear from the parties' request whether they are seeking to schedule a calendar call or pretrial conference. To the extent the parties are seeking to schedule a calendar call, that request should be included in their pretrial order. See LR 16-4.